

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 3, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-19, 22-25 and 28-41 were pending, that claims 20, 21, 26 and 27 have been withdrawn from consideration, allowed claim 36, objected to claims 15-17 and 29 and rejected claims 1-14, 18, 19, 22-25, 28, 30-35 and 37-41. Claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 22, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, and 37-41 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-19, 22-25 and 28-41 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

An interview with the Examiner was conducted on April 23, 2006 and the discussion of the interview is set forth below.

In the Action on page 11 the Examiner allowed claim 36.

In the Office Action on page 10 the Examiner objected to claims 15-17 and 29 and indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. These claims have been so rewritten and it is submitted that these claims have not been narrowed and have the same scope as prior to being made independent and are now allowable. Claim 16 depends on allowable claim 15 and claim 30 depends on allowable claim 29, so these claims are also submitted to be allowable. Claim Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 28, 31, 34, 35 and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Hanrahan. Page 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 6, 7, 18, 19 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Hanrahan and Daniels. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 22-24, 33 and 37 under § 103 over Hanrahan and Daniels. Page 8 of the Action rejects claims 8 and 10 under § 103 over Hanrahan and Morioka. Page 8 of the Office Action rejects claim 30 under 35 § 103 over Hanrahan and Daniels. Page 9 of the Office Action rejects claim 25 under § 103 over Hanrahan, Daniels and Bossut. Page 10 of the Office Action rejects claim 13 under § 103 over Hanrahan and Gueret.

Claims 1, 22, 28, 31 and 33-41 have been amended, as discussed with the Examiner in the interview, to emphasize that the "parameterization of the object is discontinuous creating texture seams" in a situation where painting is with brush orientations that minimize a distortion of a painted texture when displayed on the surface. That is, as discussed with the Examiner, the present invention minimizes distortions even when there are seams crated by the parameterization of the object.

Hanrahan, as discussed with the Examiner, on page 216 discusses allowing the user to perform "smearing". As also discussed with the Examiner, this implies that the object parameterization in Hanrahan is continuous, as a smear would be stopped when it hits a seam.

As a result, it is submitted that the inventions of claims 1, 22, 28, 31 and 33-41 distinguish over Hanrahan.

Daniels, Morioka, Bossut and Gueret add nothing to Hanrahan with respect to the feature of the inventions discussed above and it is submitted that claims 1, 22, 28, 31 and 33-41 distinguish over the prior art.

Independent claim 8 emphasizes that the normal vector is smooth geometrical normal field depending on the polygons affected by the brush. This emphasizes that the real normals, used for shading and geometrical normals are decoupled. This smoothing depending on brush size (polygons affected by the brush) is not discussed in Hanrahan or Morioka (or Daniels, Bossut and Gueret).

Independent claim 12 emphasizes that the brush is volumetric. In contrast Hanrahan places and orients 2D brushes in 3D space (see para. 6, page 219). No volumetric brush intersecting a 3D geometry is taught or suggested by Hanrahan or Daniels (or Morioka, Bossut and Gueret).

Independent claim 14 emphasizes that an intensity of portions of a brush painting varies based on a normal vector of respective portions of the surface. In Hanrahan (see para. 5, page 220) α , α 's and α are constant for a given pattern and do not depend on where the brush is located on the surface. Nor does the intensity vary based on a normal vector of the geometry affected by the brush. Daniels Morioka, Bossut and Gueret add nothing to Hanrahan with respect to this feature.

It is submitted that the inventions of the independent claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 22, 28, 31 and 33-41 distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that claims 15-17, 29 and 36 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

Serial No. 09/998,919

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 30, 2006

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501